

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action mailed March 12, 2007. Reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 – 30 are pending in the application with Claims 1, 12, 16, 29 and 30 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 1, 12, 16, 29 and 30 are amended. Support for the amendments to the base claims are found in the specification on page 7, paragraph [0024]. No new subject matter is introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendment. Accordingly, entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 stands objected to base upon informalities. Specifically, dependent Claim 6 lacks a period at the end of the claim. In response, Applicant has amended the claim to include a period.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this ground of objection.

Claims 1-8 and 12-30 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Stanczak, et al. (US 5,903,217) (hereafter “Stanczak”).

In response, Applicant notes that the base claims, as amended, now recite an apparatus for adjusting the sensitivity of a motion detector, comprising, *inter alia*, “wherein the motion detector does not notify a control panel that an intrusion has been detected based upon the frequency of the non-user activated signal” as recited in amended base Claims 1 and 12. Similarly, the remaining base claims have been amended to recite similar features such as in amended base Claim 16 which is based upon the “frequency of the remotely-generated signal” and based upon the “frequency of the transmitted signal” as recited in amended base Claim 29 or based upon the “continuously transmitted signal” as recited in amended base Claim 30.

In contrast, Stanczak discloses a microwave motion sensor for detecting multiple levels of motion of a target. Moreover, Stanczak discloses a control algorithm which changes operating modes and increases the sensitivity level of the motion sensor. However, nowhere in Stanczak's disclosure is it disclosed that a motion detector does not notify a control panel that an intrusion has been detected based upon the frequency of the non-user activated signal as recited in amended base Claims 1 and 12. Moreover, Stanczak does not disclose similar features as recited in amended base Claim 16 based upon the "frequency of the remotely-generated signal", based upon the "frequency of the transmitted signal" as recited in amended base Claim 29 or based upon the "continuously transmitted signal" as recited in amended base Claim 30.

Therefore, Stanczak fails to show at least one feature disclosed in the amended base claims.

It is well-settled by the Courts that "[A]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company, et al., 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481 (Fed. Cir., 1984).

Therefore, as demonstrated above, because Stanczak does not disclose each and every element recited in the present claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection has been obviated. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 1-8 and 12-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

### CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1 – 30 are in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Esatto, Jr.

Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DJD:tam